



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,725	05/12/2005	Hiidenori Abe	10525.0006	7083
22852	7590	09/18/2008	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			JARRELL, NOBLE E	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1624		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/18/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,725	ABE ET AL.
	Examiner NOBLE JARRELL	Art Unit 1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11-20,22,24,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11,12,14-20,22,24,26 and 27 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph has been overcome by the amendment filed 6/10/08.
2. The objections to the claims have been overcome by the amendment filed 6/10/2008.
3. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 have been overcome by the amendment filed 6/10/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14-20, 22, 24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The issues concerning the meaning of "optionally substituted benzene", "optionally substituted hydrocarbon group", and "optionally substituted heterocyclic group" are discussed in the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2 rejections. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14-20, 22, 24, and 26-27 do not contain generic formulae indicating structural makeup for the spacer that can represent variable Y or Ya. In the broadest reasonable interpretation, the only requirement for the spacer is that the main chain is 1-6 atoms. However, this does not eliminate the presence of a ring, for example, within the chain. If the ring is azepane or azocane, for example, the core structure of the compound changes. The presence of the azepane or azocane ring controls classification of the compound instead of the piperazine or piperidine ring.

According to the MPEP §2163 I. A. "the issue of a lack of adequate written description may arise even for an original claim when an aspect of the claimed invention has not been

described with sufficient particularity such that one skilled in the art would recognize that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention. The claimed invention as a whole may not be adequately described if the claims require an essential or critical feature which is not adequately described in the specification and which is not conventional in the art or known to one of ordinary skill in the art." The MPEP states in §2163 II 3 ii) "The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice (see i)(A), above), reduction to drawings (see i)(B), above), or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus (see i)(C), above). See Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406."

According to the MPEP §2163.02 Standard for Determining Compliance With the Written Description Requirement, "The courts have described the essential question to be addressed in a description requirement issue in a variety of ways. An objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, "does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed". In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPC2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Under Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991), to satisfy the written description requirement, an applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention, and that the invention, in that context, is whatever is now claimed. The test for sufficiency of support in a parent application is whether the disclosure of the application relied upon "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the later

claimed subject matter". Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co., Inc., 772 F.2d 1570, 1575, 227 USPQ 177, 179 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (quoting *In re Kaslow*, 707 F.2d 1366, 1375, 217 USPQ 1089, 1096 (Fed. Cir. 1983))."

This case was filed before Applicants had a clear idea of the structures encompassing the scope of claims 1-2 and 19-22, other than the specific compounds recited in claims 11 and 12. The specification provides broad areas of future research and speculation, inviting undue experimentation in learning how to use Applicants' invention.

Applicants are reminded of what the U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit wrote in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* 43 USPQ2d 1398, "In claims involving chemical materials, generic formulae usually indicate with specificity what the generic claims encompass. One skilled in the art can distinguish such a formula from others and can identify many of the species that the claims encompass. Accordingly, such a formula is normally an adequate description of the claimed genus." "A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. See *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1169-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1605-06 (discussing *Amgen*). "It is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what achieves that result." "The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."").

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to

enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14-20, 22, 24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for instances of variables Y and Ya as a bond, C(O), C(O)-alkyl, an unsubstituted alkyl group, and C(O)-alkyl-O, does not reasonably provide enablement for all possible spacers of 1-6 atoms. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants only show examples where Y and Ya are a bond, C(O), C(O)-alkyl, an unsubstituted alkyl group, or an C(O)-alkyl-O group.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in Wands states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) *The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:*

The claims are drawn to compounds composed of a piperidine/piperazine-bond/spacer-N-CH(C-indolyl)-C(O)-N-phenylene-alkyl-N core structure, and compositions containing the same.

(3) *The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:*

Dorwald (*Side Reaction in Organic Synthesis*, 2005, page IX of preface) teaches that organic chemistry is difficult.

(5) The relative skill of those in the art:

Those of relative skill in the art are those with level of skill of the authors of the references cited to support the examiner's position. The relative skill of those in this art is MD's, PhD's, or those with advanced degrees and the requisite experience in preparing compounds of formula I.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:

The specification has provided guidance for instances of variables Y and Ya as a bond, C(O), C(O)-alkyl, an unsubstituted alkyl group, or C(O)-alkyl-O.

However, the specification does not provide guidance for any other spacers that can represent variables Y or Ya.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14-20, 22, 24, and 26-27 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

7. Claims 22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of diabetes type II, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention of obesity or diabetes type 1 or 2 as well as the treatment of obesity. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or

with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants are only enabled only for the treatment of type II diabetes.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in Wands states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

(1) The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:

The claims are drawn to methods using compounds composed of a piperidine/piperazine-bond/spacer-N-CH(C-indolyl)-C(O)-N-phenylene-alkyl-N core structure as agents for the treatment of diabetes, diabetes complications, or obesity, as well as the inhibition of somatostatin receptor binding.

(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:

Osapay et al. (*Expert Opinion on Therapeutic Patents*, 1998, 8(7), 855-70) teach that the therapeutic uses of inhibiting somatostatin receptors are still unknown because of at least two reasons: one, a more complete understanding of their intracellular interactions is needed; and two, little is known about control or regulation of the receptor (page 867, section 6).

Obesity is not preventable through medication, but through changing the way one eats ("Obesity Prevention", <http://www.health.state.ny.us/prevention/obesity/>, accessed September 4, 2008).

(5) The relative skill of those in the art:

Those of relative skill in the art are those with level of skill of the authors of the references cited to support the examiner's position. The relative skill of those in this art is MD's, PhD's, or those with advanced degrees and the requisite experience in treatment of diabetes type 1 or 2, obesity, and the inhibition of somatostatin receptors.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:

The specification has provided guidance for *in vitro* inhibition of ¹²⁵I-Somatostatin. However, the specification does not provide guidance for the prevention of obesity or any disease related to inhibition of a somatostatin receptor.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claims 22, 24, and 26 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, 11-12, 14-20, 22, 24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. What groups are acting as substituents for ring A (phenylene)? In variables R¹ and R², what hydrocarbon groups and heterocyclic groups are present? What are the substituents for these groups? One could imagine an azocane ring present as a heterocyclic group, and consequently the classification of the compound is changed as well as the core structure. What types of diabetes is being treated in claim 24, type I or II? In claim 24, what diabetic complications are being? Boehm (*Expert Opinion on Investigational Drugs*, 2003, 12(9), 1501-1509) teaches that diabetes is associated with a wide range of vascular complications (page 1502).

Conclusion

10. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NOBLE JARRELL whose telephone number is (571)272-9077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 A.M - 6:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Noble Jarrell/
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**